

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed December 18, 2003, and the references cited by the Examiner have been carefully reviewed by Applicant. Claims 1-15 are currently pending in this Application. The Office Action rejected Claims 1-15 on various grounds discussed below. Applicant respectfully submits that the case is in condition for allowance for the reasons provided below.

**Rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102**

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hollberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,356,955). Applicant submits that the Hollberg reference is directed to a translator to convert object-oriented programming language into network communication protocols. (See Abstract). The problem as disclosed by the Hollberg reference is that it is cumbersome and time-consuming for developers of management applications to understand the intricacies of making low-level calls via the network communication protocol XMP/XOM to build communications related functions of management applications. (col. 1, lines 40-50, and col. 3, lines 6-10). Hollberg discloses developing the management applications and object-oriented programming interface (OOI) in C++ for a Unix operating system, which are system that operate in a multi-threaded environment. (col. 2, lines 12-61, col 10, lines 38-42, and Specification generally).

Hollberg never contemplated the problem and novel solution provide by Applicant in the present case. Specifically, in Applicant's single-threaded environment(s) (such as environments that do not natively support multi-threaded systems such as C++ and Unix), when the client application makes a request, processing of the client application is suspended until a response to the request is received by the client application. Hollberg fails to teach, disclose, or even suggest Applicant's novel solution of enabling asynchronous behavior to be executed in parallel within a single-threaded environment by breaking-up work with a software agent.

In rejecting of Claim 1, the Examiner states that "the client application sending a first request to a software agent running in a single-threaded environment (col. 12, lines 5-12, "For

Attorney Docket No: IDP 1421 (4000-01200)

*Patent*

asynchronous requests, a request object is allocated by the application and passed to the OOI"; col. 13, lines 45-52, "The OOI is single threaded"). Applicant respectfully submits that the Hollberg reference disclosure that the OOI may be a single-thread program fails to teach, disclose, or even suggest the client application and/or the software agent running in single-threaded environment. As discussed above, Hollberg discloses operating in a multi-threaded environment, even though the OOI may be programmed as a single-threaded application. As referenced by the Examiner, Hollberg states that the proxy agent of the OOI may be implemented in either synchronous mode where processing of the application is blocked while the request is processed, or asynchronously where control is returned to the application as soon as the request is sent by the application. (col. 8, lines 52-61). Since Hollberg discloses both the application running multiple threads, and the application and OOI running in a multi-threaded environment, Applicant respectfully submits that Hollberg fails as an anticipatory reference since Applicant's Claim 1 provides for the client application and software agent running in single-threaded environments. For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable. Applicant further submits that Claims 2-13, which depend from independent Claim 1 and include each and every element of Claim 1, are allowable for these reasons as well.

Rejection of Claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103

Claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollberg in view of Chang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,338,078) in view of Burns (U.S. Patent 6,098,090). Applicant submits that Claim 14 and 15 depend from base Claim 1, and include each and every of base independent Claim 1, which, for the reasons stated above and incorporated herein by reference, is allowable. For this reason, Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claim 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. section 103 and pass these Claims to issue.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application as amended is in condition for

Attorney Docket No: IDF 1421 (4000-01200)

Patent

allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288. Applicant intends this communication to be a complete response to the Office Action mailed on December 18, 2003.

Date:

3/18/2004

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330  
Plano, Texas 75024  
(972) 731-2288  
(972) 731-2289 Facsimile

Respectfully submitted,



Michael W. Piper  
Reg. No. 39,800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT